arXiv:1703.05001v1 [math.OC] 15 Mar 2017

PROXIMAL TWO-STAGE ALGORITHMS FOR BOX CONSTRAINED QUADRATIC PROGRAMMING *

GUOQIANG WANG†, BO YU(✉)‡, AND ZIXUAN CHEN§

Abstract. In this paper, proximal two-stage algorithms for quadratic programming problem subject only to box constraints are presented. Program of this type, is denoted by BQP, which plays an important role in many optimization models. We apply proximal point method to solve non-strictly-convex BQP problem, which has proved to be globally convergent and have linear convergence rate at local. Moreover, we show that the proximal point method is essentially linear iteration if the active-set is fixed. According to this property, we give an estimate of the linear convergence factor and present an accelerated proximal point algorithm. For strictly convex BQP problem, the accelerated proximal gradient method is first implemented to get a approximate solution; secondly, we generate a parametric programming with the approximate solution and track the solution path of the parametric programming with a simplified parametric active-set method. Moreover, in the path tracking steps, we improve the parametric active-set method by introducing a sorting technique to update the cholesky decomposition. The numerical experiments on randomly generated data set and real-world data set show the accelerated proximal point algorithm can greatly reduce the number of the iterations and the two-stage algorithm is efficient.

Key words. quadratic programming, box constraints, non-convex, proximal point method, parametric active set, homotopy

AMS subject classifications. 90C20, 90C26.

1. Introduction.

In this paper, we consider quadratic box constrained programming problem (BQP)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & q(x) \\ \text{s. t.} & l \le x \le u, \end{array} \tag{1.1}$$

where $q(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^TQx + r^Tx$, $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is symmetric but maybe indefinite, r, l and u are n-dimensional column vectors.

A basic algorithm for such problem is active-set method which solves a sequence of subproblems of the form

$$\min\{q(x^k + d) \ | d_j = 0, j \in \mathcal{A}(x^k)\}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mathcal{A}(x) = \{j | x_j = l_j \ or \ x_j = u_j\}$. Typical active-set algorithm restricts the change in $\mathcal{A}(x^k)$ and updates the active set by dropping or adding only one constraint along the descent direction at each iteration. Hence, if x^0 is faraway from the optimal solution, active-set method needs to solve many subproblems, which makes it not suitable for large scale problems.

Parametric active-set (PAS) method [11] solves a general convex quadratic programming ((1.1) is a special case with $A = I$)

* This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11571061, 11401075), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (DUT16LK05) .

† School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, Liaoning 116024, P. R. China (wangguojim@mail.dlut.edu.cn).

‡ School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, Liaoning 116024, P.R. China, and Interdisciplinary Research Institute, Dalian University of Technology at Panjin, Panjin, Liaoning 124221, China (yubo@dlut.edu.cn).

§ School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, Liaoning 116024, P. R. China (chenzixuan@mail.dlut.edu.cn).

$$\min \ \{r^T x + \tfrac{1}{2} x^T Q x |\ l \le Ax \le u\}, \tag{1.3}$$

by solving a parametric quadratic programming (PQP) problem between a QP problem ($t = 1$) with known solution and (1.3) ($t = 0, g(0) = r, b^l(0) = l, b^u(0) = u$) which we want to solve,

$$\min \ \{g(t)^T x + \tfrac{1}{2} x^T Q x |\ b^l(t) \le Ax \le b^u(t)\}, \tag{1.4}$$

This method was proposed by Ritter [24] and Best [4], which has been implemented in qpOASES [11]. Based on the property of the solution path, piece-wise linear. PAS method is essentially a homotopy method which tracks the solution path from $t = 1$ to $t = 0$. At every step of PAS, it needs to solve linear systems:

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q & A'_{\mathcal{A}} \\ A_{\mathcal{A}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \lambda_{\mathcal{A}}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -g(t) \\ b_{\mathcal{A}}(t) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{1.5}$$

which derives from the KKT conditions, where $\lambda(t)$ denotes the multipliers. If the start solution has almost the same optimal active set as the target solution, this algorithm would be very efficient. Whereas, PAS suffers from the same disadvantages as the active-set method that it needs many steps if the start active set is faraway from that of the end solution.

Another basic approach solving (1.1) is the projected-gradient method [26]. However, this method is slow at the end of the iterations, which makes it unappealing when medium to high accuracy solutions are desired. In such cases, higher-order methods might be more preferable, e.g., LBFGS-B [6], TRON [16], projected-Newton [3] and projected-quasi-Newton (PQN-BFGS, PQN-LBFGS) [14].

A reflective Newton method [9] is proposed by Coleman and Li. This method applies to a general (non-convex) BQP and exhibits strong convergence properties, global and quadratic convergence. Reflective Newton method has been implemented in Matlab *quadprog* solver.

Nesterov's accelerated proximal gradient algorithm (APG) [21, 22] is a first order algorithm, which takes small computational cost at every step and converges in a rate $O(\frac{1}{k^2})$. Due to this, APG is effective for an approximate solution. However, APG algorithm is slow at the end of the iterations, which hinders it to be an independent algorithm for (1.1) if high-precision solutions are required.

In this paper, we consider both convex and non-convex cases of (1.1). First, based on the framework of proximal point algorithm (PPA) [25], we solve non-strictly convex BQP by solving a sequence of strictly convex BQP problems. In [25], Rockafellar showed PPA algorithm has linear convergence rate when Q is positive definite. Luo and Tseng [17] proved PPA algorithm also has linear convergence when it is applied to quadratic programming. Luo's proof is based on a framework of feasible descent methods, which concludes PPA as a special case. We give a more deeper analysis on the convergence, that, we show that PPA algorithm is essentially linear iteration when the active-set is fixed. According to this property, we give an estimation of the linear convergence factor and present an accelerated form of proximal point algorithm.

Secondly, inspired by that, APG is efficient for an approximate solution, which gives a good estimation of the optimal active-set and PAS method requires a good estimate of the optimal active-set. We present a two-stage algorithm for strictly convex

BQP problem. In the first stage, we use APG algorithm to obtain an approximate solution and generate a PQP

$$\min \ \{(f+tw)^T x + \tfrac{1}{2}x^T Q x | l \le x \le u\}. \tag{1.6}$$

between an initial BQP problem whose solution is known and a strictly convex BQP problem which we want to solve. In the second stage, we use a simplified PAS method which does not iterate the multipliers to track the solution path of (1.6). Benefiting from the approximately solving, the steps of PAS method would greatly reduce. At last, we improve the parametric active-set algorithm by introducing a sorting technique to update the cholesky decomposition, which takes smaller computations than that in qpOASES.

The organization of the rest of this paper is as follows. In the second section, the optimality conditions of the BQP problem are given. In Section 3, we implement PPA for non-strictly-convex BQP problem and present the convergence analysis. Moreover, based on the the convergence analysis, we give an estimate of the linear convergence factor and present an accelerated PPA. A two-stage algorithm is presented for strictly convex BQP problem in Section 4. Finally, the numerical results are displayed in Section 5.

2. Optimality conditions. Let

$$\Omega = \{x \in R^n : l \le x \le u\}, \tag{2.1}$$

denote the feasible set of problem (1.1) and assume $\inf_{x\in\Omega} q(x) > -\infty$. Moreover, let X^* denote the set which consists of all Karush-Kuhn-Tucker points. Then for any $x^* \in X^*$, the following optimality conditions hold.

$$\frac{\partial q}{\partial x_j}(x^*) \ge 0, \ j \in \mathcal{A}_l(x^*), \tag{2.2}$$

$$\frac{\partial q}{\partial x_j}(x^*) = 0, \ j \in \mathcal{A}_m(x^*), \tag{2.3}$$

$$\frac{\partial q}{\partial x_j}(x^*) \le 0, \ j \in \mathcal{A}_u(x^*), \tag{2.4}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_l(x) = \{j | x_j = l_j\}$, $\mathcal{A}_m(x) = \{j | l_j < x_j < u_j\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_u(x) = \{j | x_j = u_j\}$.

3. Proximal point algorithm and convergence. We implement PPA to solve problem (1.1) when Q is not positive definite. In this section, we prove the convergence properties, global convergence and linear convergence at local. We show that PPA is essentially linear iteration when the active-set settles down. According to this property, we give an estimate of the convergence factor of PPA and present an accelerated PPA.

Let $\gamma = \delta - \lambda_{\min}(Q)$, where $\delta > 0$ is a constant. Sequence $\{x^k\}$ are obtained by PPA iterations:

$$x^{k+1} = \arg\min \ \{q(x) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x - x^k\|^2 | x \in \Omega\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Then (3.1) is a strictly convex BQP problem, which is solved by a two-stage algorithm in Section 4.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Assume sequence $\{x^k\}$ are obtained by (3.1), then $q(x^{k+1}) \le q(x^k)$ and $\|x^k - x^{k+1}\| \to 0$.*

Proof. It is easy to see

$$q(x^{k+1}) \leq q(x^{k+1}) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 \leq q(x^k) \tag{3.2}$$

by (3.1), hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{K}\|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 &\leq \frac{2}{\gamma}\sum_{k=0}^{K}(q(x^k) - q(x^{k+1})) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\gamma}(q(x^0) - q(x^{K+1})).\end{aligned}$$

Since $q(x)$ is lower bounded on Ω, $q(x^0) - q(x^{K+1}) < \infty$ for any $K > 0$, which implies $\|x^k - x^{k+1}\| \to 0$. ∎

3.1. Global convergence. In this section, we establish $\{x^k\}$ globally converge. We first present two Lemmas.

Let $\Omega_1^\infty = \Omega^\infty \cap \{d|\ \|d\| = 1\}$, where Ω^∞ is the asymptotic cone of Ω.

LEMMA 3.2. *For any $d \in \Omega_1^\infty$, $d^TQd \geq 0$. Furthermore, if $d^TQd = 0$, then $q(x) \leq q(x + \alpha d), \forall x \in \Omega, \forall \alpha \geq 0$.*

Proof. It is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned}q(x + \alpha d) - q(x) &= \frac{1}{2}(x + \alpha d)^TQ(x + \alpha d) + r^T(x + \alpha d) - \frac{1}{2}x^TQx - r^Tx \\ &= \frac{\alpha^2}{2}d^TQd + \alpha d^T(Qx + r) \\ &> -\infty,\end{aligned}$$

which implies $d^TQd \geq 0$.

Furthermore, if $d^TQd = 0$, then

$$q(x + \alpha d) - q(x) = \alpha(Qx + r)^Td > -\infty, \forall \alpha \geq 0,$$

which implies $(Qx + r)^Td \geq 0$. Hence, $q(x) \leq q(x + \alpha d)$. ∎

LEMMA 3.3. *For any $f, d \in \Omega_1^\infty$, there exists $\varepsilon_d > 0$ such that if $\mathrm{dist}(f, d) \leq \varepsilon_d$, then $f \in \mathrm{ri}(\mathrm{span}(f, d) \cap \Omega^\infty)$, where $\mathrm{dist}(f, d) = \arccos d^Tf$.*

Proof. Let $D = \{-e_i|l_i = -\infty, i = 1, 2, ..., n\} \cup \{e_i|u_i = \infty, i = 1, 2, ..., n\}$, where e_i is the i-th unit coordinate vector. Moreover, let $r = |D|$, then for any $d \in \Omega^\infty$, there exists unique positive linear representation

$$d = \sum_{i=1}^{r}\pi_i(d)d_i,$$

where $d_i \in D$, $\pi_i(d) = \max(0, d^Td_i)$.

Now, let

$$\varepsilon_d = \frac{1}{2\pi}\min_{\pi_i(d)\neq 0}\pi_i(d).$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\pi_i(f) - \pi_i(d)\| &\leq \|f - d\| \\ &\leq \pi\mathrm{dist}(f, d) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\min_{\pi_i(d)\neq 0}\pi_i(d).\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$u = \sum_{i=1}^{r} (2\pi_i(f) - \pi_i(d))d_i,$$

it is easy to see that $u \in \Omega^\infty$ and $f = \frac{1}{2}u + \frac{1}{2}d$, so $f \in \mathrm{ri}(\mathrm{span}(f,d) \cap \Omega^\infty)$. □

Before the next theorem, some notations are required.

Let $\bar{\Omega} = \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \times ... \times \Omega_n$, where

$$\Omega_i = \begin{cases} l_i & l_i > -\infty, u_i = \infty; \\ u_i & l_i = -\infty, u_i < \infty; \\ 0 & l_i = -\infty, u_i = \infty; \\ [l_i, u_i] & l_i > -\infty, u_i < \infty. \end{cases} \quad i = 1, 2, ...n.$$

Then for any x^k, there exist unique $y^k \in \bar{\Omega}$ and $d^k \in \Omega_1^\infty$ such that

$$x^k = y^k + \alpha^k d^k,$$

where $\alpha^k \geq 0$.

Moreover, let $\bar{D} = \{d | \exists x^{k_i}, i = 1, ..., \infty, \textit{such that } d^{k_i} \to d \textit{ and } \alpha^{k_i} \to \infty\}$, it is easy to see that $\bar{D} \subset \Omega_1^\infty$ and $d^T Q d = 0, \forall d \in \bar{D}$, then we have the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.4. *If $d \in \bar{D}$ and $\mathrm{dist}(d^k, d) \leq \varepsilon_d$, then $\alpha^k d^T d^k \leq \alpha^{k-1} d^T d^{k-1}$.*

Proof. In fact, if $\alpha^k d^T d^k > \alpha^{k-1} d^T d^{k-1}$, then there exists a small enough $\alpha > 0$ such that $x^k - \alpha d \in \Omega$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^k - \alpha d - x^{k-1}\|^2 &= \|y^k - y^{k-1}\|^2 + \|\alpha^k d^k - \alpha d - \alpha^{k-1} d^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &= \|y^k - y^{k-1}\|^2 + \|\alpha^k d^k - \alpha^{k-1} d^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad -\alpha(\alpha^k d^k - \alpha^{k-1} d^{k-1})^T d + \alpha^2 d^T d \\ &= \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - \alpha(\alpha^k d^k - \alpha^{k-1} d^{k-1})^T d + \alpha^2 d^T d \\ &< \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Furthermore, we have $q(x^k - \alpha d) \leq q(x^k)$ by Lemma 3.2. Hence,

$$q(x^k) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 > q(x^k - \alpha d) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x^k - \alpha d - x^{k-1}\|^2,$$

which is a contradiction to (3.1). So $\alpha^k d^T d^k \leq \alpha^{k-1} d^T d^{k-1}$. □

Next, one of the results of this paper is presented.

THEOREM 3.5. *The sequence $\{x^k\}$ obtained by (3.1) are bounded.*

Proof. If $\{x^k\}$ are not bounded, then $\bar{D}$ is not empty.

According to the definition of $\bar{D}$, we have that for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, there exists $M_{\varepsilon_1} > 0$ such that if $\alpha^k > M_{\varepsilon_1}$, then $\mathrm{dist}(d^k, \bar{D}) < \varepsilon_1$.

From (3.3), we have $\|\alpha^k d^k - \alpha^{k-1} d^{k-1}\| \to 0$. Then for any $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, we can find N, such that, if $k > N$, then $\|\alpha^k - \alpha^{k-1}\| < \varepsilon_2$.

Moreover, there exists $\varepsilon_3 > 0$, such that if $\mathrm{dist}(d^k, \bar{D}) < \varepsilon_3$, then we can find $s^k \in \bar{D}$ makes $\mathrm{dist}(s^k, d^k) < \min(\frac{\pi}{3}, \varepsilon_{s^k})$.

In fact, if no such ε_3 exists, then for any sequence $\{\varepsilon_3^i\}_{i=1}^\infty \to 0$, we can find sequence $\{d^{k_i}\}_{i=1}^\infty$ satisfy

$$\mathrm{dist}(d^{k_i}, \bar{D}) < \varepsilon_3^i \text{ and } \forall d \in \bar{D}, \mathrm{dist}(d^k, d) \geq \min(\frac{\pi}{3}, \varepsilon_d).$$

It is easy to see $\{d^{k_i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ have one accumulation point $\tilde{d} \in \bar{D}$, hence, there exists j such that $\text{dist}(d^{k_j}, \tilde{d}) < \min(\frac{\pi}{3}, \varepsilon_{\tilde{d}})$, which is a contradiction.

Now, let $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_3$ and

$$M = \max(\alpha^{N+1} + 1, M_{\varepsilon_3}, \max_{k \le N} \alpha^k).$$

When $k \le N+1$, it is easy to see that $\alpha^k \le M$.

When $k > N+1$, if $\alpha^k > M$, then there exists $s^k \in \bar{D}$, such that $\text{dist}(s^k, d^k) \le \min(\frac{1}{2}, \varepsilon_{s^k})$. From Theorem 3.4, we have

$$\alpha^k {s^k}^T d^k \le \alpha^{k-1} {s^k}^T d^{k-1} \le \ldots \le \alpha^{k-p} {s^k}^T d^{k-p}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $0 \le p \le k - N$ is the smallest integer which makes one of the following two cases occour.

(i) $\alpha^{k-p} > M$ and $\alpha^{k-p-1} \le M$;

(ii) $\text{dist}(s^k, d^{k-p}) < \min(\frac{\pi}{3}, \varepsilon_{s^k})$ and $\text{dist}(s^k, d^{k-p-1}) \ge \min(\frac{\pi}{3}, \varepsilon_{s^k})$.

If p makes (i) cocur, then we have

$$\alpha^k {s^k}^T d^k \le \alpha^{k-p} {s^k}^T d^{k-p} \le M + \varepsilon_3.$$

So

$$\alpha^k = \frac{M + \varepsilon_3}{{s^k}^T d^k} \le 2(M + \varepsilon_3). \tag{3.5}$$

If p makes (ii) occur, then we have

$$\alpha^k {s^k}^T d^k \le \alpha^{k-p-1} {s^k}^T d^{k-p-1}. \tag{3.6}$$

by Theorem 3.4. Since $\text{dist}(s^k, d^k) < \min(\frac{\pi}{3}, \varepsilon_{s^k}) \le \text{dist}(s^k, d^{k-p-1})$, we obtain ${s^k}^T d^k \ge {s^k}^T d^{k-p-1}$, which derives

$$\alpha^k \le \alpha^{k-p-1} \tag{3.7}$$

by (3.6). Furthermore, if $\alpha^{k-p-1} \le M$, we obtain $\alpha^k \le 2(M + \varepsilon_3)$ by (3.5) and (3.7); if $\alpha^{k-p-1} > M$, repeat the steps above until (i) occurs. It is easy to see (i) will occur in one loop for $\alpha^{N+1} < M$. So we obtain $\alpha^k \le 2(M + \varepsilon_3)$, which completes the proof. □

THEOREM 3.6. *Assume $\bar{x}$ is one accumulation point of $\{x^k\}$. If the strict complementarity conditions hold at $\bar{x}$, then $\lim_{k\to\infty} x^k = \bar{x}$.*

Proof. For convenience, we use $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m$ to denote $\mathcal{A}_m(\bar{x})$, which is similar to $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_l$ and $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u$.

Since the strict complementarity conditions hold at $\bar{x}$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\nabla q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_l}(x) > 0,\ 0 < x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} < u_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m},\ \nabla q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u}(x) < 0, \forall x \in B(\bar{x}, \varepsilon). \tag{3.8}$$

i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A}_l(x) = \bar{\mathcal{A}}_l,\ \mathcal{A}_m(x) = \bar{\mathcal{A}}_m,\ \mathcal{A}_u(x) = \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u. \tag{3.9}$$

Moreover, there exists $N > 0$ such that $x^N \in B(\bar{x}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ and $\|x^k - x^{k+1}\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \forall k \ge N$, it implies $x^{N+1} \in B(\bar{x}, \varepsilon)$.

Hence, we have

$$Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}x^{N+1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} + Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_l}l_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_l} + Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u}u_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u} + r_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} + \gamma(x^{N+1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - x^{N}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}) = 0, \quad (3.10)$$

$$Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}\bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} + Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_l}l_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_l} + Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u}u_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u} + r_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} + \gamma(\bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}) = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

So we arrive at

$$(Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} + \gamma I)(x^{N+1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}) = \gamma(x^{N}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}),$$

that is,

$$(x^{N+1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}) = M(x^{N}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}), \quad (3.12)$$

where $M = \gamma(Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} + \gamma I)^{-1}$ is positive definite.

Let $\bar{\lambda}_1 \geq \bar{\lambda}_2 \geq ... \geq \bar{\lambda}_s$ denote the eigenvalues of $Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}$ and $\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_2, ..., \bar{v}_s$ are the corresponding unit eigenvectors, where $s = |\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m|$. Then $\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_2, ..., \bar{v}_s$ are the eigenvectors of M as well, and the corresponding eigenvalues are $0 < \frac{\gamma}{\bar{\lambda}_1+\gamma} \leq \frac{\gamma}{\bar{\lambda}_2+\gamma} \leq ... \leq \frac{\gamma}{\bar{\lambda}_s+\gamma}$.

Assume

$$x^{N}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \bar{\alpha}_i\bar{v}_i,$$

hence,

$$x^{N+1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{\gamma\bar{\alpha}_i}{\bar{\lambda}_i+\gamma}\bar{v}_i.$$

We derive from (3.8) and (3.9) that $\|x^{N+1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}\| = \|x^{N+1} - \bar{x}\|$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(x^N) - q(\bar{x}) &= \frac{1}{2}(x^N - \bar{x})^T Q(x^N - \bar{x}) + (x^N - \bar{x})^T(Q\bar{x} + r) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(x^N_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m})^T Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}(x^N_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i\gamma^2\bar{\alpha}_i^2}{(\bar{\lambda}_i+\gamma)^2} \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

In order to show $x^{N+1} \in B(\bar{x}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^N - \bar{x}\|^2 - \|x^{N+1} - \bar{x}\|^2 &= \|x^N_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}\|^2 - \|x^{N+1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{s} \bar{\alpha}_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{\gamma^2\bar{\alpha}_i^2}{(\bar{\lambda}_i+\gamma)^2} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i\bar{\alpha}_i^2}{(\bar{\lambda}_i+\gamma)} + \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{\gamma\bar{\lambda}_i\bar{\alpha}_i^2}{(\bar{\lambda}_i+\gamma)^2} \\ &\geq (\bar{\lambda}_{\bar{k}}+\gamma)\sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i\bar{\alpha}_i^2}{(\bar{\lambda}_i+\gamma)^2} + \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{\gamma\bar{\lambda}_i\bar{\alpha}_i^2}{(\bar{\lambda}_i+\gamma)^2} \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where $\bar{k}$ satisfies $\bar{\lambda}_{\bar{k}} \geq 0 > \bar{\lambda}_{\bar{k}+1}$. So we have $\|x^{N+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x^N - \bar{x}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Through induction, we obtain $\|x^{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x^k - \bar{x}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \forall k \geq N$, which implies $\lim_{k\to\infty} x^k = \bar{x}$. ∎

3.2. Linear convergence. Next, we show the proximal point method has linear convergence rate at local. Before this, we introduce a lemma.

LEMMA 3.7. *Assume $A \in R^{n\times n}$ is positive definite. If $\|A^k v\| \to 0$, then there exists $\rho \in (0,1)$, such that $\|A^k v\| \le \rho\|A^{k-1}v\|$. Moreover, v belongs to the eigen-subspace of which the corresponding eigenvalues are smaller than 1.*

Proof. Let $\lambda_1 \ge \lambda_2 \ge ... \ge \lambda_n > 0$ denote the eigenvalues of A and $v_1, v_2, ..., v_n$ are corresponding unit eigenvectors which satisfy $v_i^T v_j = 0, \forall i \ne j$. v has linear representation by $v_1, v_2, ..., v_n$ as follows

$$v = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i v_i,$$

then

$$A^k v = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \lambda_i^k v_i \tag{3.15}$$

which implies $\alpha_i = 0$, if $\lambda_i \ge 1$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|A^k v\| &= \|\sum_{\alpha_i\ne 0} \alpha_i \lambda_i^k v_i\| \\ &\le \max_{\alpha_i\ne 0}(\lambda_i)\|\sum_{\alpha_i\ne 0} \alpha_i \lambda_i^{k-1} v_i\| \\ &= \rho\|A^{k-1}v\|\end{aligned}$$

where $\rho = \max_{\alpha_i\ne 0}(\lambda_i) < 1$. ∎

THEOREM 3.8. *Assume the strict complementarity conditions hold at $\bar{x}$. Then there exists $\bar{\rho} = \max_{\lambda_i(M)<1}(\lambda_i(M)) = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\min_{\bar{\lambda}_i>0}(\bar{\lambda}_i)} \in (0,1)$, such that, the following items hold for all $k \ge N$.*

(i) $\|x^{k+1} - x^{k+2}\| \le \bar{\rho}\|x^k - x^{k+1}\|$ *and* $\|x^{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \le \bar{\rho}\|x^k - \bar{x}\|$.

(ii) $q(x^k) - q(\bar{x}) \le \frac{\|Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}\|\bar{\rho}^{2(k-N)}}{2(1-\bar{\rho})^2}\|x^N - x^{N+1}\|^2$.

Proof. Similar to (3.12), we have

$$x^{k+1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - x^{k+2}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} = M(x^k_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - x^{k+1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}) \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$x^{k+1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} = M(x^k_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}) \tag{3.17}$$

when $k \ge N$. Then we obtain (i) immediately by Theorem 3.6 and Lemma 3.7.

Moreover, when $k \ge N$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}q(x^k) - q(\bar{x}) &= \frac{1}{2}(x^k_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m})^T Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}(x^k_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} - \bar{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}) \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\|Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}\|\|x^k - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\|Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}\|\sum_{i=k}^{\infty}\|x^i - x^{i+1}\|^2 \\ &\le \frac{\|Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}\|}{2(1-\bar{\rho})^2}\|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\le \frac{\|Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}\|\bar{\rho}^{2(k-N)}}{2(1-\bar{\rho})^2}\|x^N - x^{N+1}\|^2. \quad ∎\end{aligned}$$

So we assert that proximal point algorithm has linear convergence rate at local when it is applied to (1.1). Next, we will give another result.

THEOREM 3.9. *If* $\bar{v}_s^T(x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{N+1} - x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{N}) \neq 0$, *then* $Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}$ *is positive definite. Furthermore, if* $\bar{\lambda}_{s-1} > \bar{\lambda}_s$, *then*

$$\frac{x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{k+1} - x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{k}}{\|x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{k+1} - x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{k}\|} \to \bar{v}_s. \tag{3.18}$$

Proof. Let

$$x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{N+1} - x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{N} = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \tilde{\alpha}_i \bar{v}_i.$$

denote the linear representation of $x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{N+1} - x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{N}$ by $\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_2, ..., \bar{v}_s$. Since

$$x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{k+1} - x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{k} = M^{(k-N)}(x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{N+1} - x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{N}) \to 0 \tag{3.19}$$

and

$$\bar{v}_s^T(x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{N+1} - x_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^{N}) \neq 0, \tag{3.20}$$

we have $\lambda_{\max}(M) = \frac{\gamma}{\bar{\lambda}_s+\gamma} < 1$ by Lemma 3.7, which implies $\bar{\lambda}_s > 0$, that is, $Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}$ is positive definite. Finally, (3.18) is an immediate result by (3.19) which is linear iteration. □

COROLLARY 3.10. *If* (3.20) *and the strict complementarity conditions hold at* $\bar{x}$, *then* $\bar{x}$ *is a strict local minimizer.*

Proof. Assume $d \in R^n$ is a feasible direction of Ω at $\bar{x}$, then

$$d_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_0} \geq 0, \ d_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u} \leq 0.$$

So if there exists $j \in \mathcal{A}_0(\bar{x}) \cup \mathcal{A}_u(\bar{x})$, such that $d_j \neq 0$, then

$$q(\bar{x} + \alpha d) = q(\bar{x}) + \alpha d^T \nabla q(\bar{x}) + o(\alpha^2).$$

we have $d^T \nabla q(\bar{x}) > 0$ for the strict complementarity conditions hold at $\bar{x}$. So $q(\bar{x} + \alpha d) > q(\bar{x})$ when $\alpha > 0$ is small enough.

If $d_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_0 \cup \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u} = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} q(\bar{x} + \alpha d) - q(\bar{x}) &= \frac{\alpha^2}{2} d^T Q d + \alpha d^T (Q\bar{x} + r) \\ &= \frac{\alpha^2}{2} d_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}^T Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} d_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

However, there exist special cases such that (3.20) does not hold and $Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m}$ is not positive definite.

EXAMPLE 3.11.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & \frac{1}{2}(x_1 - \frac{1}{2})^2 - \frac{1}{2}(x_2 - \frac{1}{2})^2 \\ \text{s. t.} & 0 \leq x_1, x_2 \leq 1. \end{array} \tag{3.21}$$

Given $x^0 = (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\gamma = 1.001$, we obtain x^k by proximal point algorithm, then

$$x_1^{k+1} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} + \gamma x_1^k}{\gamma + 1},\ x_2^{k+1} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

So $x^k \to \bar{x} = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ which is a saddle point and $\|x^{k+2} - x^{k+1}\| = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|$. However, $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m = \{1, 2\}$ and $Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m \bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ is not positive definite.

If $x^0 = (0, \frac{1}{2} + 10^{-4})$, then

$$x_1^{k+1} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} + \gamma x_1^k}{\gamma + 1},\ x_2^{k+1} = \min\{1, \frac{\gamma x_2^k - \frac{1}{2}}{\gamma - 1}\}.$$

x_2^k converges to 1 quickly, in particular, $x_2^k = 1, k \geq 2$. Hence, $x^k \to \bar{x} = (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ which is a local minimizer and $\|x^{k+2} - x^{k+1}\| = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|, k \geq 2$. Moreover, $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m = \{1\}$ and $Q_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m \bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} = 1$ is positive definite.

3.3. Accelerated Proximal point algorithm (APPA). Assume $\{x^k\}_{k=K_1}^{K_2}$ have the same active set, where $K_1 \leq K_2$. Then we have form (3.10) and (3.11) that

$$(Q_{\mathcal{A}_m^k \mathcal{A}_m^k} + \gamma I)(x^k - x^{k-1}) = \gamma(x^{k-1} - x^{k-2}), \forall K_1 + 2 \leq k \leq K_2,$$

which is linear iteration. Let $\omega_k = \frac{\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|}{\|x^{k-1} - x^{k-2}\|}$. If ω_k tends to one constant $\bar{\omega} < 1$, we have

$$x^k - x^{k-1} \approx \bar{\omega}(x^{k-1} - x^{k-2}),$$

which implies

$$x^{K_2} \approx x^k - \frac{1 - \bar{\omega}^{K_2 - k}}{1 - \bar{\omega}}(x^k - x^{k+1}), \tag{3.22}$$

According to (3.22), we present an accelerated PPA iteration:

$$x^{k+1} = \arg\min\ \{q(x) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x - \frac{x^k - \omega_k x^{k-1}}{1 - \omega_k}\|^2 | x \in \Omega\}. \tag{3.23}$$

Precisely, we replace PPA iterations (3.1) by APPA iterations (3.23) when

$$\omega_{k-j+1} < 1 \ and\ |\omega_{k-j+1} - \omega_{k-j}| < \varepsilon, j = 1, 2, ...a, \tag{3.24}$$

where ε and a are pre-given. After one iteration of (3.23), x^{k+1} quickly tends to x^{K_2}, but ω_{k+1} may not satisfy (3.24). Thus, we need to switch to PPA iterations until (3.24) holds again.

4. Algorithm. When Q is not positive definite, PPA and APPA obtain a Karush-Kuhn-Tucker point of (1.1) after solving a sequence of strictly convex BQP problems. When Q is positive definite, we solve (1.1) directly. Benefiting form the positive definiteness of Q, the linear systems in the simplified PAS method is not degenerate and can be solved by cholesky decomposition.

4.1. A two-stage algorithm for strictly convex BQP. In this section, we present a two-stage algorithm for strictly convex BQP problem. As described in the introduction, PAS method is efficient if a good estimate of the optimal active set is given. Due to this, we use APG algorithm to obtain an approximate solution before PAS method. Benefiting from the approximate solving by APG, The steps of PAS method is small.

Since the PQP problem in this paper is simple on constraints, we simplify PAS method to solve our PQP problem that we does not iterate the multipliers as the original PAS method. At last of this section, we present a sorting technique to update the cholesky decomposition, which takes smaller computations than that in qpOASES.

For convenience, we write the strictly convex BQP (3.1) and (3.23) in a uniform form

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & \frac{1}{2}z^T Hz + f^T z \\ \text{s. t.} & l \le x \le u, \end{array} \tag{4.1}$$

where H is positive definite. It is easy to see that (3.1) is a special case of (4.1) with $H = Q + \gamma I$, $f = r - \gamma x^k$

We know from (2.2)-(2.4) that $\bar{z}$ is the solution of (4.1) if and only if $\bar{z}$ satisfies

$$H_j^T \bar{z} + f_j \ge 0, \ j \in \mathcal{A}_l(\bar{z}), \tag{4.2}$$
$$H_j^T \bar{z} + f_j = 0, \ j \in \mathcal{A}_m(\bar{z}), \tag{4.3}$$
$$H_j^T \bar{z} + f_j \le 0, \ j \in \mathcal{A}_u(\bar{z}), \tag{4.4}$$

where H_j denotes the j-th column of H, f_j denotes the j-th element of f.

We use APG algorithm to predict the solution of (4.1) as follows:

Let $l = 1$, $\rho_1 = 1$, and $z^1 = y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is given, then

$$y^l = \arg\min_{l \le z \le u} \langle Hz^l + f, z\rangle + \frac{L}{2}\|z - z^l\|^2, \tag{4.5}$$
$$\rho_{l+1} = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\rho_l^2}}{2}, \tag{4.6}$$
$$z^{l+1} = y^l + (\frac{\rho_l - 1}{\rho_{l+1}})(y^l - y^{l-1}), \tag{4.7}$$

where $L \ge \|H\|$. At each iteration, (4.39) can be fast solved by a truncation operator as follows:

$$y^l = T(z^l - \tfrac{1}{L}(Hz^l + f)) = [z^l - \tfrac{1}{L}(Hz^l + f)]_+. \tag{4.8}$$

So we just need to do one matrix-vector multiplication. However, APG is slow at the end of the iterations, thus we terminate APG iterations when one of the following criterions is satisfied.

$$\pi_{\varepsilon_1}(y^l) = \pi_{\varepsilon_1}(y^{l-i}), \ for \ i = 1, .., S_{\max}, \tag{4.9}$$
$$\frac{\|y^l - y^{l-1}\|}{\|y^l\|} < \varepsilon_2, \tag{4.10}$$

where $\pi_{\varepsilon_1}(y) = |\{j | l_j + \|y\|\varepsilon_1 < y_j < u_j - \|y\|\varepsilon_1\}|$. $S_{\max}$, ε_1 and ε_2 are some parameters which are pre-given.

With the first stage, we obtain an approximate solution of (4.1). Then, we obtain

$$\hat{z} = \begin{cases} l_j & y_j^l \le l_j + \eta\|y^l\|; \\ y_j^l & l_j - \eta\|y^l\| < y_j^l < u_j + \eta\|y^l\|; \\ u_j & y_j^{l,k} \ge u_j - \eta\|y^l\|. \end{cases} \tag{4.11}$$

by filtration with η, where $\eta > 0$ is a small number. The active-set of $\hat{z}$ is a good prediction to that of $\tilde{z}$, which would greatly reduce the steps of the second-stage algorithm.

Next, we generate a PQP problem.

Let

$$w = \begin{cases} \xi_1 & \hat{z}_j = l_j; \\ -H_j^T\hat{z} - f_j & l_j < \hat{z}_j < u_j; \\ \xi_2 & \hat{z}_j = u_j, \end{cases} \tag{4.12}$$

where $\xi_1 = -\min_j\{H_j^T\hat{z} + f_j | \hat{z}_j = l_j\} + \delta$, $\xi_2 = -\max_j\{H_j^T\hat{z} + f_j | \hat{z}_j = u_j\} - \delta$ and $\delta > 0$. So $\hat{z}$ is the solution of

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & \frac{1}{2}z^THz + (f+w)^Tz \\ \text{s. t.} & l \le x \le u. \end{array} \tag{4.13}$$

A linear homotopy between the objective function of (4.1) and (4.13) is

$$h(t,z) = \tfrac{1}{2}z^THz + (f+tw)^Tz\ ,\ t \in [0,1]. \tag{4.14}$$

Then we can obtain the solution of (4.1) by solving the PQP problem

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & h(t,z) = \frac{1}{2}z^THz + (f+tw)^Tz \\ \text{s. t.} & l \le z \le u. \end{array} \tag{4.15}$$

In the second stage, we use PAS method to track the solution path of (4.15). Since (4.15) is simple on constraints, we does not iterate multipliers in the tracking steps. We simplify the PAS method to solve (4.15) as follows.

Let $z(t)$, $t \in [0,1]$ be a vector-function of t denoting the solution path of (4.15) and suppose $z(t)$ has M piece-wise intervals, moreover, set $t_0 = 1, t_M = 0$. Let (t_i, t_{i-1}), $i = 1, ..., M$ denote the intervals, in which, $z(t)$ is linear. Let $\mathcal{A}_m^i = \{\mathcal{A}_m(z(t)) | t \in (t_i, t_{i-1})\}$ denote the work set, $\mathcal{A}_l^i = \{\mathcal{A}_l(z(t)) | t \in (t_i, t_{i-1})\}$ denote the lower active-set and $\mathcal{A}_u^i = \{\mathcal{A}_u(z(t)) | t \in (t_i, t_{i-1})\}$ denote the upper active set accordingly.

Before presenting the simplified PAS algorithm, we make the following assumption.

ASSUMPTION 4.1. *There is no interval $(a,b) \subset [0,1]$ such that there exists j satisfies*

$$z_j(t) = l_j \text{ and } H_j^Tz(t) + f_j + tw_j = 0, \forall t \in (a,b) \tag{4.16}$$

or

$$z_j(t) = u_j \text{ and } H_j^Tz(t) + f_j + tw_j = 0, \forall t \in (a,b), \tag{4.17}$$

where $a < b$.

Then we have

THEOREM 4.1. *If Assumption 4.1 holds, then for any $i \in \{1, ..., M\}$, there exists only one classification $(\mathcal{S}_l^i, \mathcal{S}_m^i, \mathcal{S}_u^i)$ of $\{1, ..., n\}$ such that*

$$0 < z_{\mathcal{S}_m^i}(t) = -H_{\mathcal{S}_m^i \mathcal{S}_m^i}^{-1}(H_{\mathcal{S}_m^i \mathcal{S}_u^i} u_{\mathcal{S}_u^i} + H_{\mathcal{S}_m^i \mathcal{S}_l^i} l_{\mathcal{S}_l^i} + f_{\mathcal{S}_m^i} + tw_{\mathcal{S}_m^i}) < u, \tag{4.18}$$

$$z_{\mathcal{S}_l^i}(t) = l_{\mathcal{S}_l^i}, \tag{4.19}$$

$$H_{\mathcal{S}_l^i}^T z(t) + f_{\mathcal{S}_l^i} + tw_{\mathcal{S}_l^i} > 0, \tag{4.20}$$

$$z_{\mathcal{S}_u^i}(t) = u_{\mathcal{S}_u^i}, \tag{4.21}$$

$$H_{\mathcal{S}_u^i}^T z(t) + f_{\mathcal{S}_u^i} + tw_{\mathcal{S}_u^i} < 0, \tag{4.22}$$

for any $t \in (t_i, t_{i-1})$, where $|\mathcal{S}_u^i|$ denotes the number of the elements of $\mathcal{S}_u^i$, $H_{\mathcal{S}_m^i \mathcal{S}_m^i}$ denotes the sub-matrices of H with appropriate rows and columns.

Proof. It is obvious that $(\mathcal{A}_l^i, \mathcal{A}_m^i, \mathcal{A}_u^i)$ satisfies (4.18)-(4.22) by the optimality conditions (2.2)-(2.4).

Now, assume there exists another classification $(\mathcal{B}_l^i, \mathcal{B}_m^i, \mathcal{B}_u^i)$ that satisfies (4.18)-(4.22). It is easy to see that $\mathcal{A}_m^i \subset \mathcal{B}_m^i$ by (4.18). Moreover, for any $j \in \mathcal{B}_m^i \backslash \mathcal{A}_m^i$, $H_j^T z(t) + f_j + tw_j = 0$ by (4.18) and $z_j(t) = l_j$ or $z_j(t) = u_j$ by (4.19) and (4.21). This contradicts with Assumption 4.1, so $(\mathcal{A}_l^i, \mathcal{A}_m^i, \mathcal{A}_u^i)$ is the only classification satisfing (4.18)-(4.22). □

Under Assumption 4.1, we start PAS algorithm with $t_0 = 1$, $i = 1$, $z(t_0) = \hat{z}$, $\mathcal{A}_l^1 = \mathcal{A}_l(\hat{z})$, $\mathcal{A}_m^1 = \mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})$ and $\mathcal{A}_u^1 = \mathcal{A}_u(\hat{z})$. By induction, we need to confirm t_i and the classification $(\mathcal{A}_l^{i+1}, \mathcal{A}_m^{i+1}, \mathcal{A}_u^{i+1})$ in the $(i+1)$-th interval, $i = 1, 2, ..., M$.

According to the optimality conditions (2.2)-(2.4), $z(t)$ satisfies

$$H_{\mathcal{A}_l^i \mathcal{A}_m^i} z_{\mathcal{A}_m^i}(t) + H_{\mathcal{A}_l^i \mathcal{A}_l^i} l_{\mathcal{A}_l^i} + H_{\mathcal{A}_l^i \mathcal{A}_u^i} u_{\mathcal{A}_u^i} + (f_{\mathcal{A}_l^i} + tw_{\mathcal{A}_l^i}) \geq 0, \tag{4.23}$$

$$H_{\mathcal{A}_m^i \mathcal{A}_m^i} z_{\mathcal{A}_m^i}(t) + H_{\mathcal{A}_m^i \mathcal{A}_l^i} l_{\mathcal{A}_l^i} + H_{\mathcal{A}_m^i \mathcal{A}_u^i} u_{\mathcal{A}_u^i} + (f_{\mathcal{A}_m^i} + tw_{\mathcal{A}_m^i}) = 0, \tag{4.24}$$

$$H_{\mathcal{A}_u^i \mathcal{A}_m^i} z_{\mathcal{A}_m^i}(t) + H_{\mathcal{A}_u^i \mathcal{A}_l^i} l_{\mathcal{A}_l^i} + H_{\mathcal{A}_u^i \mathcal{A}_u^i} u_{\mathcal{A}_u^i} + (f_{\mathcal{A}_u^i} + tw_{\mathcal{A}_u^i}) \leq 0 \tag{4.25}$$

in the i-th interval. Continue to decrease t from t_{i-1} until one of the following events occurs.

(i) There exists $j \in \mathcal{A}_m^i$ such that $z_j(t) = l_j$.

(ii) There exists $j \in \mathcal{A}_m^i$ such that $z_j(t) = u_j$.

(iii) There exists $j \in \mathcal{A}_l^i$ such that $H_{j\mathcal{A}_m^i} z_{\mathcal{A}_m^i}(t) + H_{j\mathcal{A}_l^i} l_{\mathcal{A}_l^i} + H_{j\mathcal{A}_u^i} u_{\mathcal{A}_u^i} + (f_j + tw_j) = 0$.

(iv) There exists $j \in \mathcal{A}_u^i$ such that $H_{j\mathcal{A}_m^i} z_{\mathcal{A}_m^i}(t) + H_{j\mathcal{A}_l^i} l_{\mathcal{A}_l^i} + H_{j\mathcal{A}_u^i} u_{\mathcal{A}_u^i} + (f_j + tw_j) = 0$.

No matter which event occurs, the classification needs to be updated.

According to (i)-(iv), we define

$$\hat{j}_l^i = \arg\max_j \{\frac{\mu_j^i - l_j}{\nu_j^i} < t_{i-1} | j \in \mathcal{A}_m^i \text{ and } \nu_j^i < 0\}, \tag{4.26}$$

$$\hat{j}_u^i = \arg\max_j \{\frac{\mu_j^i - u_j}{\nu_j^i} < t_{i-1} | j \in \mathcal{A}_m^i \text{ and } \nu_j^i > 0\}, \tag{4.27}$$

$$\tilde{j}_l^i = \arg\max_j \{\frac{\vartheta_j^i}{\theta_j^i} < t_{i-1} | j \in J^i \text{ and } \theta_j^i < 0\}, \tag{4.28}$$

$$\tilde{j}_u^i = \arg\max_j \{\frac{\varphi_j^i}{\phi_j^i} < t_{i-1} | j \in J_c^i \text{ and } \phi_j^i > 0\}, \tag{4.29}$$

where

$$\mu^i = -H^{-1}_{\mathcal{A}^i_m\mathcal{A}^i_m}(H_{\mathcal{A}^i_m\mathcal{A}^i_l}l_{\mathcal{A}^i_l} + H_{\mathcal{A}^i_m\mathcal{A}^i_u}u_{\mathcal{A}^i_u} + f_{\mathcal{A}^i_m}), \tag{4.30}$$

$$\nu^i = H^{-1}_{\mathcal{A}^i_m\mathcal{A}^i_m}f_{\mathcal{A}^i_m}, \tag{4.31}$$

$$\vartheta^i = H_{\mathcal{A}^i_l\mathcal{A}^i_m}\mu^i + H_{\mathcal{A}^i_l\mathcal{A}^i_l}l_{\mathcal{A}^i_l} + H_{\mathcal{A}^i_l\mathcal{A}^i_u}u_{\mathcal{A}^i_u} + f_{\mathcal{A}^i_l}, \tag{4.32}$$

$$\theta^i = H_{\mathcal{A}^i_l\mathcal{A}^i_m}\nu^i - w_{\mathcal{A}^i_l}, \tag{4.33}$$

$$\varphi^i = H_{\mathcal{A}^i_u\mathcal{A}^i_m}\mu^i + H_{\mathcal{A}^i_u\mathcal{A}^i_l}l_{\mathcal{A}^i_l} + H_{\mathcal{A}^i_u\mathcal{A}^i_u}u_{\mathcal{A}^i_u} + f_{\mathcal{A}^i_u}, \tag{4.34}$$

$$\phi^i = H_{\mathcal{A}^i_u\mathcal{A}^i_m}{}^i\nu^k - w_{\mathcal{A}^i_u}. \tag{4.35}$$

If there exists no $\hat{j}^i_l$ satisfies (4.26), then let $\frac{\mu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}}{\nu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}} = -\infty$, and similarly holds for $\hat{j}^i_u$, $\tilde{j}^i_l$ and $\tilde{j}^i_u$. Then we discuss the homotopy tracking algorithm in four cases.

Case 1: $\frac{\mu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}}{\nu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}} > \max(\frac{\mu^i_{\hat{j}^i_u}}{\nu^i_{\hat{j}^i_u}}, \frac{\vartheta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\theta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}, \frac{\varphi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\phi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}})$ and $\frac{\mu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}}{\nu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}} > 0$.

It means (i) occurs first. We obtain $t_i = \frac{\mu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}}{\nu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}}$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m = \mathcal{A}^i_m \backslash \hat{j}^i_l$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l = \mathcal{A}^i_l \cup \hat{j}^i_l$ and $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u = \mathcal{A}^i_u$, let $\tilde{z}(t)$ has closed form

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{z}_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m}(t) = -H^{-1}_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m}(&H_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u}u_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u} \\ &+H_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l}l_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l} + f_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m} + tw_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m}),\end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

$$\tilde{z}_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l}(t) = l_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l}, \tag{4.37}$$

$$\tilde{z}_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u}(t) = u_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u} \tag{4.38}$$

in the $(i+1)$-th interval. According to Lemma 4.1, we need to validate $\tilde{z}(t)$ satisfies (4.18)-(4.22) when $t \in (t_i - \tau, t_i)$, where $\tau > 0$ is small enough. (4.19), (4.21) are obvious by (4.37) and (4.38), and (4.22) holds for $\frac{\mu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}}{\nu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}} > \frac{\varphi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\phi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}$. Since $\tilde{z}(t)$ is continuous about t, it is easy to see $0 < \tilde{z}_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m}(t) < u_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m}$, $\forall t \in (t_i - \tau, t_i)$, when τ is small enough, then we obtain (4.18) by (4.36). So we just need to validate (4.20). Similar to above, $H^T_{\mathcal{A}^i_l}\tilde{z}(t) + f_{\mathcal{A}^i_l} + tw_{\mathcal{A}^i_l} > 0$ holds for $\tilde{z}(t)$ is continuous about t on $(t_i - \tau, t_i)$, thus, we only need to verify $H^T_{\hat{j}^i_l}\tilde{z}(t) + f_{\tilde{j}^i_l} + tw_{\hat{j}^i_l} > 0$ when $t \in (t_i - \tau, t_i)$, which can be finished by validating $\theta^{i+1}_{\hat{j}^i_l} > 0$. If (4.18)-(4.22) hold, the update is correct, then $z(t) = \tilde{z}(t)$ in the $(i+1)$-th interval; otherwise, $\hat{j}^i_l$ should not be added to $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m$, that is, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m = \mathcal{A}^i_m$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l = \mathcal{A}^i_l$ and $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u = \mathcal{A}^i_u$.

Case 2: $\frac{\mu^i_{\hat{j}^i_u}}{\nu^i_{\hat{j}^i_u}} > \max(\frac{\mu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}}{\nu^i_{\hat{j}^i_l}}, \frac{\vartheta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\theta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}, \frac{\varphi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\phi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}})$ and $\frac{\mu^i_{\hat{j}^i_u}}{\nu^i_{\hat{j}^i_u}} > 0$.

It means (ii) occurs first. We obtain $t_i = \frac{\mu^i_{\hat{j}^i_u}}{\nu^i_{\hat{j}^i_u}}$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m = \mathcal{A}^i_m \backslash \hat{j}^i_u$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l = \mathcal{A}^i_l$ and $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u = \mathcal{A}^i_u \cup \hat{j}^i_u$. Let $\tilde{z}(t)$ has closed form as (4.36)-(4.38) in the $(i+1)$-th interval. Similar to Case 1. we need to validate $\tilde{z}(t)$ satisfies (4.18)-(4.22) when $t \in (t_i - \tau, t_i)$. (4.19), (4.21) and the equality of (4.18) are obvious by (4.36)-(4.38). Since $\tilde{z}(t)$ is continuous about t, $H^T_{\mathcal{A}^i_u}\tilde{z}(t) + f_{\mathcal{A}^i_u} + tw_{\mathcal{A}^i_u} > 0$, $0 < \tilde{z}_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m}(t) < u_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m}$ and (4.20) hold, $\forall t \in (t_i - \tau, t_i)$, when τ is small enough. At last, we only need to confirm $H^T_{\hat{j}^i_u}\tilde{z}(t) + f_{\tilde{j}^i_u} + tw_{\hat{j}^i_u} > 0$, when $t \in (t_i - \tau, t_i)$, which can be finished by validating

$\phi^{k,i+1}_{\tilde{j}^i_u} < 0$. If (4.18)-(4.22) hold, the update is correct, then $z(t) = \tilde{z}(t)$ in the $(i+1)$-th interval; otherwise, $\hat{j}^i_u$ should not be added to $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m$, that is, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m = \mathcal{A}^i_m$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l = \mathcal{A}^i_l$ and $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u = \mathcal{A}^i_u$.

Case 3: $\frac{\vartheta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\theta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}} > \max(\frac{\mu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\nu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}, \frac{\mu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\nu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}, \frac{\varphi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\phi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}})$ and $\frac{\vartheta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\theta^{k,i}_{\tilde{j}^i_l}} > 0$.

It means (iii) occurs first, then we obtain $t_i = \frac{\vartheta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\theta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m = \mathcal{A}^i_m \cup \tilde{j}^i_l$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l = \mathcal{A}^i_l \backslash \tilde{j}^i_l$ and $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u = \mathcal{A}^i_u$. Let $\tilde{z}(t)$ has closed form as (4.36)-(4.38) in the $(i+1)$-th interval. Similar to the above cases. we need to validate $\tilde{z}(t)$ satisfies (4.18)-(4.22) when $t \in (t_i - \tau, t_i)$. The equality of (4.18), (4.19) and (4.21) are obvious by (4.36)-(4.38). (4.20) and (4.22) hold by the continuation of $\tilde{z}(t)$ on $(t_i - \tau, t_i)$, so we only need to validate $0 < \tilde{z}_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m}(t) < u_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m}, \forall t \in (t_i - \tau, t_i)$. The second inequality is obvious for $\frac{\vartheta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\theta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}} > \frac{\varphi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\phi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}$, and the first inequality can be finished by just verifying $\tilde{z}_{\tilde{j}^i_l}(t_i) > 0$, that is, $\nu^{i+1}_{\tilde{j}^i_l} > 0$. If it holds, the update is correct; otherwise, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m = \mathcal{A}^i_m$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l = \mathcal{A}^i_l$ and $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u = \mathcal{A}^i_u$.

Case 4: $\frac{\varphi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\phi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}} > \max(\frac{\mu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\nu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}, \frac{\mu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\nu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}, \frac{\vartheta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\theta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}})$ and $\frac{\varphi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\phi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}} > 0$.

It means (iv) occurs first, then we obtain $t_i = \frac{\varphi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\phi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m = \mathcal{A}^i_m \cup \tilde{j}^i_u$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l = \mathcal{A}^i_l$ and $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u = \mathcal{A}^i_u \backslash \tilde{j}^i_u$. Let $\tilde{z}(t)$ has closed form as (4.36)-(4.38) in the $(i+1)$-th interval. Similar to Case 3. we need to validate $\tilde{z}(t)$ satisfies (4.18)-(4.22) when $t \in (t_i - \tau, t_i)$. It can be finished by just confirming $0 < \tilde{z}_{\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m}(t) < u$, $\forall t \in (t_i - \tau, t_i)$. The first inequality is obvious for $\frac{\varphi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\phi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}} > \frac{\vartheta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_0}}{\theta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_0}}$, and the second inequality can be finished by just validating $\tilde{x}_{\tilde{j}^i_u}(t_i) > 0$, that is, $\nu^{i+1}_{\tilde{j}^i_u} > 0$. If both of them hold, the update is correct; otherwise, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_m = \mathcal{A}^i_m$, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_l = \mathcal{A}^i_l$ and $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}_u = \mathcal{A}^i_u$.

Case 5: $\max(\frac{\mu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\nu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}, \frac{\mu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\nu^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}, \frac{\vartheta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}{\theta^i_{\tilde{j}^i_l}}, \frac{\varphi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}{\phi^i_{\tilde{j}^i_u}}) \le 0$.

In this case, the algorithm will end and we obtain

$$z_{\mathcal{A}^i_m}(0) = -H^{-1}_{\mathcal{A}^i_m \mathcal{A}^i_m}(H_{\mathcal{A}^i_m \mathcal{A}^i_u} u_{\mathcal{A}^i_u} + H_{\mathcal{A}^i_m \mathcal{A}^i_l} l_{\mathcal{A}^i_l} + f_{\mathcal{A}^i_m}), \tag{4.39}$$

$$z_{\mathcal{A}^i_l}(0) = l_{\mathcal{A}^i_l}, \tag{4.40}$$

$$z_{\mathcal{A}^i_u}(0) = u_{\mathcal{A}^i_u}. \tag{4.41}$$

Then we have $\bar{z} = z(0)$, which is the solution of (4.1). At each step of PAS, we need to solve two symmetric positive definite linear systems of equations

$$H_{\mathcal{A}^i_m \mathcal{A}^i_m} \mu^i = -H_{\mathcal{A}^i_m \mathcal{A}^i_l} l_{\mathcal{A}^i_l} - H_{\mathcal{A}^i_m \mathcal{A}^i_u} u_{\mathcal{A}^i_u} - f_{\mathcal{A}^i_m}, \tag{4.42}$$

$$H_{\mathcal{A}^i_m \mathcal{A}^i_m} \nu^i = w_{\mathcal{A}^i_m}, \tag{4.43}$$

and do matrix-vector multiplications in (4.32)-(4.35).

Due the positive definiteness of $H_{\mathcal{A}^i_m \mathcal{A}^i_m}$, we apply cholesky decomposition method for (4.42) and (4.43). Moreover, since $\mathcal{A}^i_m$ changes few elements at each step, instead of decomposing $H_{\mathcal{A}^i_m \mathcal{A}^i_m}$ from scratch, we give an update techniques for cholesky decomposition which is different from that in qpOASES [10, 11].

Note that the index j_1 is more likely to be removed from $\mathcal{A}^i_m$ than j_2 if

$$\min(|\hat{z}_{j_1} - l_{j_1}|, |\hat{z}_{j_1} - u_{j_1}|) \le \min(|\hat{z}_{j_2} - l_{j_2}|, |\hat{z}_{j_2} - u_{j_2}|).$$

So at the start of the homotopy tracking stage, we sort $\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})$ by the value of $\hat{z}_j, j \in \mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\min(|\hat{z}_{[\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})]_s} - l_{[\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})]_s}|, |\hat{z}_{[\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})]_s} - u_{[\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})]_s}|) \\ \geq &\min(|\hat{z}_{[\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})]_{s+1}} - l_{[\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})]_{s+1}}|, |\hat{z}_{[\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})]_{s+1}} - u_{[\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})]_{s+1}}|), \end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

where $[\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})]_s$ denotes the s-th element of $\mathcal{A}_m(\hat{z})$. With this sorting technique, the indices removed from $\mathcal{A}_m^i$ would be focused at the end of $\mathcal{A}_m^i$. Moreover, when an index is added to $\mathcal{A}_m^i$, we put it at the end of $\mathcal{A}_m^i$. Precisely, we update cholesky decomposition as follows.

• **Update cholesky decomposition.** Assume $\mathcal{A}_m^i$ is known, and $H_{\mathcal{A}_m^i\mathcal{A}_m^i}$ has cholesky decomposition

$$R^T R = H_{\mathcal{A}_m^i\mathcal{A}_m^i}.$$

▷ Add an index $\tilde{j}$ to $\mathcal{A}_m^i$, then

$$H_{\mathcal{A}_m^{i+1}\mathcal{A}_m^{i+1}} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{\mathcal{A}_m^i\mathcal{A}_m^i} & H_{\mathcal{A}_m^i\tilde{j}} \\ H_{\tilde{j}\mathcal{A}_m^i} & H_{\tilde{j}\tilde{j}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $H_{\mathcal{A}_m^{i+1}\mathcal{A}_m^{i+1}} = \tilde{R}^T\tilde{R}$ is the cholesky decomposition, we have

$$\tilde{R} = \begin{bmatrix} R & \tilde{r} \\ 0 & \sqrt{H_{\tilde{j}\tilde{j}} - \tilde{r}^T\tilde{r}} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $R^T\tilde{r} = H_{\mathcal{A}_m^i\tilde{j}}$, so this update will take noly $\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_i^2$ flops ,where $\Gamma_i = |\mathcal{A}_m^i|$.

▷ Remove an index $\hat{j}$ from $\mathcal{A}_m^i$, then

$$H_{\mathcal{A}_m^{i+1}\mathcal{A}_m^{i+1}} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^i\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^i} & H_{\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^i\mathcal{A}_{m,2}^i} \\ H_{\mathcal{A}_{m,2}^i\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^i} & H_{\mathcal{A}_{m,2}^i\mathcal{A}_{m,2}^i} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathcal{A}_m^i = [\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^i, \hat{j}, \mathcal{A}_{m,2}^i]$. Assume $H_{\mathcal{A}_m^{i+1}\mathcal{A}_m^{i+1}} = \hat{R}^T\hat{R}$ is the cholesky factorization, then we have

$$\hat{R} = \begin{bmatrix} R_{I_1^iI_1^i} & R_{I_1^iI_2^i} \\ 0 & \bar{R} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $I_1^i = \{1, ..., |\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^i|\}$, $I_2^i = \{|\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^i| + 2, ..., |\mathcal{A}_m^i|\}$ and $\bar{R}^T\bar{R} = H_{\mathcal{A}_{m,2}^i\mathcal{A}_{m,2}^i} - R_{I_1^iI_2^i}^T R_{I_1^iI_2^i}$, so in this case it will take $\frac{2}{3}|I_2^i|^3$ flops.

Precisely, it takes

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_i^2, & add; \\ \frac{2}{3}|I_2^i|^3 + (\Gamma_i - |I_2^i|)|I_2^i|^2, & remove; \end{cases} \tag{4.45}$$

flops to update the cholesky decomposition in each step of PAS method with sorting technique, where $(\Gamma_i - |I_2^i|)|I_2^i|^2$ is to the matrix-vector multiplications $R_{I_1^iI_2^i}^T R_{I_1^iI_2^i}$. The update techniques of the PAS method in qpOASES would take

$$\begin{cases} 5\Gamma_i^2, & add; \\ \frac{5}{2}\Gamma_i^2, & remove; \end{cases} \tag{4.46}$$

flops at each step. Our update technique will take smaller computations when adding an index than that in qpOASES. Benefiting from the sorting technique, $|I_2^i| \ll \Gamma_i$, then the removing update is cheap.

Now, we conclude the framework of the two-stage (APG-PAS) algorithm as Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 APG-PAS algorithm for strictly convex BQP problem

Input: z^0;
Output: $\bar{z}$.
Approximately solve (4.1) with APG algorithm until (4.9) or (4.10) is satisfied;
Obtain a warm start $\hat{z}$ like (4.11) and generate a PQP problem (4.15);
Track the solution path of (4.15) from $t = 1$ to $t = 0$ and obtain $\bar{z}$ in a form like (4.39)-(4.41).

4.2. Practical proximal two-stage algorithm for non-strictly-convex BQP.

Note that it is not necessary to compute the exact solution of (3.1) in the previous iterations of PPA, so we directly go to the next iteration when y^l makes $q(x)$ decrease enough, that is, y^l satisfies

$$q(y^l) \leq q(x^k) - f_\varepsilon, \tag{4.47}$$

where $f_\varepsilon > 0$ is given. Then we have Algorithm 2 and 3.

Algorithm 2 PPA/APG-PAS algorithm for non-strictly-convex BQP

Input: x^0, tol, f_ε;
Output: x^{k+1};
while $\|x^k - x^{k+1}\| > tol$ **do**
  Approximately solve (3.1) with APG until (4.9) or (4.10) is satisfied;
  if $q(y^l) \leq q(x^k) - f_\varepsilon$ **then**
    $x^{k+1} = y^l$;
  else
    Obtain a warm start $\hat{z}$ like (4.11) and generate a PQP problem (4.15);
    Track the solution path of (4.15) from $t = 1$ to $t = 0$ and return x^{k+1} in a form like (4.39)-(4.41).
  end if
end while

Algorithm 3 APPA/APG-PAS algorithm for non-strictly-convex BQP

Input: x^0, tol, f_ε;
Output: x^{k+1};
while $\|x^k - x^{k+1}\| > tol$ **do**
  if ω_k satisfies (3.24) **then**
    Approximately solve (3.23) with APG until (4.9) or (4.10) is satisfied;
  else
    Approximately solve (3.1) with APG until (4.9) or (4.10) is satisfied;
  end if
  if $q(y^l) \leq q(x^k) - f_\varepsilon$ **then**
    $x^{k+1} = y^l$;
  else
    Obtain a warm start $\hat{z}$ like (4.11) and generate a PQP problem (4.15);
    Track the solution path of (4.15) from $t = 1$ to $t = 0$ and return x^{k+1} in a form like (4.39)-(4.41).
  end if
end while

5. Numerical experiments. In this section, we present numerical results obtained from an implementation of our algorithms described above. The numerical experiments were performed by Matlab 8.1 programming platform (R2013a) running on a machine with Windows 8 Operation System, Intel(R) Core(TM)i7 CPU 4790 3.60GHz processor and 16GB of memory. For convenience, we use TRF to denote the reflective Newton method (Matlab *quadprog*). In our test, we terminated LBFGS-B if the number of maximum iterations reaches 1000 or $\|g(x)\|_\infty < 10^{-8}$, where

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} Q_i^T x + r_i, & i \in \mathcal{A}_m(x); \\ 0, & else. \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

FNNLS [5] is Bro and Jong's improved implementation of the Lawson-Hanson NNLS procedure [15]. We terminated it if $\|g(x)\|_\infty < 10^{-8}$. Moreover, we set the 'MaxIter' of TRF to be 1000 and the 'TolFun' to be 10^{-14}. In our algorithms, we terminated PPA and APPA when $\|x^k - x^{k-1}\| < 10^{-11}$.

5.1. Nonnegative least-squares problems. Nonnegative least-squares problem [15]

$$\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n} \ \tfrac{1}{2}\|Ax-b\|^2 \quad s.t. \ \ x \geq 0, \tag{5.2}$$

is a classical problem in scientific computing. Applications include image restoration [20], non-negative matrix factorization [2], etc. Many algorithms can be applied to solve this kind of problems, e.g., LBFGS-B, TRF and FNNLS.

• **Random NNLS problems:** Given $m > n$, we randomly generated NNLS problems with Matlab codes:

A=sprandn(m,n,ρ); $\bar{x}$=randn(n,1); $\bar{x} = \bar{x}. * (\bar{x} > 0)$; $b = A * \bar{x}$;

The data was divided into two cases: dense NNLS problems (NNLS-D) and sparse NNLS problems (NNLS-S).

TABLE 5.1
NNLS-D

A	NNLS-D1	NNLS-D2	NNLS-D3	NNLS-D4	NNLS-D5
$m \times n$	1000×800	2000×500	5000×4000	8000×7000	15000×6000

TABLE 5.2
NNLS-S

A	NNLS-S1	NNLS-S2	NNLS-S3	NNLS-S4	NNLS-S5
$m \times n$	10000×9000	20000×16000	30000×15000	50000×30000	80000×20000
sparsity	0.999	0.999	0.9998	0.9998	0.9998

We first compared APG-PAS algorithm with LBFGS-B and FNNLS on solving NNLS-D and NNLS-S. We use the residual $\|Ax-b\|$ and $\|g(x)\|$ to measure the precision. The results are shown in Table 5.3 and 5.4. It shows that our algorithm outperforms FNNLS. L-BFGSB is efficient for this data set, but the precision of LBFGS-B is not very high. Our algorithm is also efficient to solve such data set and can obtain higher-precision solution than LBFGS-B.

• **Image debluring:** Image deblurring [1, 13] is a linear inverse problem, which discrete form is

$$Ax + \eta = y,$$

TABLE 5.3
Experiments on NNLS-D

Methods	NNLS-D1	NNLS-D2	NNLS-D3	NNLS-D4	NNLS-D5
APG-PAS	0.11s	0.05s	1.10s	4.34s	1.74s
$\|g(x)\|$	1.69E-11	1.86E-11	4.19E-10	1.24E-09	1.73E-09
$\|Ax-b\|$	7.26E-13	5.65E-13	6.81E-12	1.56E-11	1.69E-11
LBFGS-B	0.09s	0.06s	1.18s	4.07s	1.19s
$\|g(x)\|$	1.82E-04	2.38E-04	3.14E-03	4.25E-03	5.25E-03
$\|Ax-b\|$	1.46E-05	7.69E-06	1.02E-04	1.16E-04	7.22E-05
FNNLS	0.55s	0.07s	91.17s	655.77s	330.41s
$\|g(x)\|$	2.11E-11	2.00E-11	5.60E-10	1.49E-09	2.29E-09
$\|Ax-b\|$	7.44E-13	5.99E-13	8.71E-12	2.00E-11	2.11E-11

TABLE 5.4
Experiments on NNLS-S

Methods	NNLS-S1	NNLS-S2	NNLS-S3	NNLS-S4	NNLS-S5
APG-PAS	1.97s	4.82s	1.41s	18.24s	3.89s
$\|g(x)\|$	1.45E-12	5.22E-12	7.65E-12	3.84E-12	4.39E-12
$\|Ax-b\|$	5.13E-13	1.43E-12	1.51E-12	1.28E-12	1.07E-12
LBFGS-B	4.54s	4.43s	2.54s	41.18s	5.50s
$\|g(x)\|$	1.89e-05	2.27e-05	8.16e-06	2.27e-05	1.75e-05
$\|Ax-b\|$	1.10e-04	1.04e-05	3.25e-06	5.02e-05	8.91e-06
FNNLS	897.12s	6902.58s	5201.17s	Hours	Hours
$\|g(x)\|$	1.30e-12	2.00E-11	5.54e-12	-	-
$\|Ax-b\|$	5.01e-13	5.99E-13	3.17e-12	-	-

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2 \times N^2}$ is a large ill-conditioned matrix representing the blurring phenomena, η is modeling noise. The vector x represents the unknown true image, y is the blurred-noisy copy of x.

A typical model for deblurring is NNLS:

$$\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n} \ \tfrac{1}{2}\|Ax-y\|^2 \quad s.t. \ \ x \geq 0. \tag{5.3}$$

Since problem (5.3) is ill-posed, it should be regularized. We add the Tikhonov regularization $\frac{\beta}{2}\|x\|^2$ to the objective, that is,

$$\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n} \ \tfrac{1}{2}\|Ax-y\|^2 + \tfrac{\beta}{2}\|x\|^2 \quad s.t. \ \ x \geq 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Then for any y, the solution of (5.4) is unique.

We obtained the satellite image from [13] and the star image from [19]. The black-white grid image was generated by ourselves. All of them are in size 256×256. We used the motion blur kernel to blur the satellite image and the circular averaging blur kernel to the star image. The black-white grid image was blurred by Gaussian blur kernel. The noise η was obtained from Gaussian noise with intensity 0.001, that is, $\eta = 0.001 * \text{randn}(N^2, 1)$.

We use APG-PAS, LBFGS-B and TRF to solve (5.4), and we do not present the results of FNNLS for it does not scale on these problems. The running time and precision are shown in Table 5.5. These three methods are efficient to solve (5.4). LBFGS-B outperforms TRF and is competitive to our algorithm in running time, but our algorithm has advantage in precision.

5.2. General BQP. In this part, we tested our algorithms on solving general BQPs including random non-convex BQPs and three partial differential optimization problems: the obstacle problem [23], the elastic-plastic torsion problem [12], and the journal bearing problem [7, 8].

• **Random non-convex BQP.** Similarly, we generated data in dense (NCBQP-D) and sparse (NCBQP-S) cases. The Matlab codes are as follows:

$B = \text{sprandn}(n, n, \rho); Q = B' + B + \lambda * \text{speye}(n, n)$;r=randn(n,1);

TABLE 5.5
Deblurring with $\beta = 0.001$

Methods	Satellite image	Star image	Black-white grid image
APG-PAS	21.57s	30.32s	34.48s
$\|g(x)\|$	5.03E-14	1.17E-13	3.64E-13
LBFGS-B	23.74s	34.33s	26.24s
$\|g(x)\|$	2,93E-07	7.67E-08	1.59E-06
TRF	54.14s	159.68s	44.18s
$\|g(x)\|$	6.03E-04	2.36E-04	1.50E-03



FIG. 5.1. *Original satellite image and blurred-noisy image: blurred with motion blur kernel*



FIG. 5.2. *Deblurring using APG-PAS, LBFGS-B and TRF with* $\beta = 0.001$



FIG. 5.3. *Original star image and blurred-noisy image: blurred with circular averaging blur kernel*

TABLE 5.6
NCBQP-D with $\lambda = 10$

Q	NCBQP-D1	NCBQP-D2	NCBQP-D3	NCBQP-D4	NCBQP-D5
n	1000	2000	3000	4000	5000

l=zeros(n,1);u=10*ones(n,1);

We compared PPA/APG-PAS and APPA/APG-PAS algorithms with LBFGS-B and TRF on solving NCBQP-D and NCBQP-S. The parameters in (3.24) was set to



FIG. 5.4. *Deblurring using APG-PAS, LBFGS-B and TRF with* $\beta = 0.001$



FIG. 5.5. *Original black-white grid image and blurred-noisy image: blurred with Gaussian blur kernel*



FIG. 5.6. *Deblurring using APG-PAS, LBFGS-B and TRF with* $\beta = 0.001$

TABLE 5.7
NCBQP-S with $\lambda = 1$

Q	NCBQP-S1	NCBQP-S2	NCBQP-S3	NCBQP-S4	NCBQP-S5
n	3000	5000	8000	10000	15000
sparsity	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99

be

$$\varepsilon = 10^{-1} \text{ and } a = 1.$$

The results show LBFGS-B and TRF do not scale on the large scale problems in NCBQP-D. TRF is competitive to PPA/APG-PAS on solving small to medium scale problems in NCBQP-S, but PAA/APG-PAS obtain higher-precision solution. Moreover, our APPA/APG-PAS outperforms TRF on solving NCBQP-D. Figure 5.7 shows that PPA converges linearly at local and APPA greatly reduces the iterations.

• **Partial differential optimization.** The obstacle problem, the elastic-plastic torsion problem, and the journal bearing problem are formulated in a form

TABLE 5.8
Experiments on NCBQP-D

Methods	NCBQP-D1	NCBQP-D2	NCBQP-D3	NCBQP-D4	NCBQP-D5
PPA/APG-PAS	4.85s	41.57s	109.31s	159.57s	227.62s
$\|g(x)\|$	7.95E-10	1.17E-09	1.44E-09	1.69E-09	1.90E-09
APPA/APG-PAS	0.80s	5.83s	12.20s	24.14s	36.78s
$\|g(x)\|$	7.70e-10	9.91E-10	1.42E-09	1.62E-09	1.65E-09
LBFGS-B	0.45s	3.03s	7.09s	15.04s	26.17s
$\|g(x)\|$	1.05E-04	2.94E-04	6.14E-03	4.97E-02	1.31E+01
TRF	1.61s	5.55s	14.49s	15.96s	57.21s
$\|g(x)\|$	3.11E-05	6.50E-05	1.25E-05	1.82E-04	7.26E+01

TABLE 5.9
Experiments on NCBQP-S

Methods	NCBQP-S1	NCBQP-S2	NCBQP-S3	NCBQP-S4	NCBQP-S5
PPA/APG-PAS	2.69s	7.74s	17.01s	40.94s	172.90s
$\|g(x)\|$	1.15E-10	1.45E-10	1.80E-10	1.99E-10	2.46E-10
APPA/APG-PAS	0.57s	1.06s	3.44s	7.27s	15.73s
$\|g(x)\|$	6.60E-11	1.09E-10	1.81E-10	1.98E-10	2.16E-10
LBFGS-B	0.42s	0.98s	4.10s	5.64s	10.42s
$\|g(x)\|$	1.99E-05	2.66E-05	2.48E-03	1.05E+01	7.09E+01
TRF	0.41s	0.89s	2.17s	3.21s	8.21s
$\|g(x)\|$	5.96E-07	9.60E-06	3.40E-06	2.74E-05	2.20E-05



FIG. 5.7. *Iterative points distance for NCBQP-D3 (left) and NCBQP-S5 (right)*

$$\begin{cases} \min\ q(v) = \dfrac{1}{2}\displaystyle\int_{\mathcal{D}} w\|\nabla v\|^2 d\mathcal{D} - \int_{\mathcal{D}} f v d\mathcal{D} \\ \text{s.t. } v \in K, \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is an open set with a reasonably smooth boundary $\partial\mathcal{D}$, and $w, f \in H_0^1(\mathcal{D})$.

The obstacle problem A is a case of (5.5) with

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D} = (0,1)\times(0,1), \\ K = \{H_0^1(\mathcal{D}) : v_l \le v \le v_u \ on\ \mathcal{D}\}, \\ v_l(x,y) = \sin(3.2x)\sin(3.2y), v_u(x,y) = 2000; \\ w \equiv 1, f \equiv c, \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

the obstacle problem B with

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D} = (0,1) \times (0,1), \\ K = \{H_0^1(\mathcal{D}) : v_l \le v \le v_u \ on \ \mathcal{D}\}, \\ v_l(x,y) = (\sin(9.3x)\sin(9.3y))^3, \\ v_u(x,y) = (\sin(9.3x)\sin(9.3y))^2 + 0.02 \\ w \equiv 1, f \equiv c, \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

the elastic-plastic torsion problem with

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D} = (0,1) \times (0,1), \\ K = \{v \in H_0^1(\mathcal{D}) : |v(x)| \le \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{D}),\ x \in \mathcal{D}\}, \\ w \equiv 1, f \equiv c, \end{cases} \tag{5.8}$$

and the journal bearing problem with

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D} = \{(\theta, y) : 0 < \theta < 2\pi, 0 < y < 2b\}, \\ K = \{v \in H_0^1(\mathcal{D}) : v \ge 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{D}\}, \\ w = (1 + \epsilon\cos\theta)^3, f = \epsilon\sin\theta, \epsilon \in (0,1). \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

We followed Moré [18] by using finite difference to discretize (5.5). For convenience, assume $\mathcal{D} = (d_1, d_2) \times (d_3, d_4)$. Let h_x and h_y denote the grid spacings and

$$z_{i,j} = (d_1 + ih_x, d_3 + jh_y),\ 0 \le i \le n_x + 1,\ 0 \le j \le n_y + 1$$

denote the grid points, where $n_x = \frac{d_2 - d_1}{h_x}, n_y = \frac{d_4 - d_3}{h_y}$.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{D}} w\|\nabla v\|^2 d\mathcal{D} = \frac{h_x h_y}{4} \sum_{i,j} (\mu_{i,j}(\frac{v_{i+1,j} - v_{i,j}}{h_x})^2 + \mu_{i,j}(\frac{v_{i,j+1} - v_{i,j}}{h_y})^2 \\ + \lambda_{i,j}(\frac{v_{i-1,j} - v_{i,j}}{h_x})^2 + \lambda_{i,j}(\frac{v_{i,j-1} - v_{i,j}}{h_y})^2) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}} f v d\mathcal{D} = h_x h_y \sum f_{i,j} v_{i,j},$$

where $\mu_{i,j} = \frac{h_x h_y}{6}(w_{i+1,j} + w_{i,j} + w_{i,j+1})$ and $\lambda_{i,j} = \frac{h_x h_y}{6}(w_{i-1,j} + w_{i,j} + w_{i,j-1})$.

The above discrete problems have been included in the Cutest test set[1] (e.g. OBSTCLAE, TORSION1, JNLBRNGA, etc). We solved the discrete problems by our algorithms and compared with LBFGS-B and TRF. We use $n = n_x n_y$ to denote the dimension of the discrete problems. The results show TRF is competitive to our algorithm on these problems, but the precision of TRF is much lower than our algorithm. Except for Obstacle B problem, LBFGS-B can obtain higher precision solution than TRF, but it takes much more time.

In order to show our sorting technique is useful, we compared the improved PAS method with the PAS method in qpOASES on solving the the four discrete PDE optimization problems from the approximate solution $\hat{z}$ and display the results in Table 5.14. We use "PAS-Sort" to denote the improved PAS algorithm which uses sorting technique. The results show our sorting technique is useful.

[1] http://www.cuter.rl.ac.uk/Problems/mastsif.shtml

TABLE 5.10
Experiments on obstacle problem A with c=1

n	6400	10000	14400
APG-PAS	0.19s	0.22s	0.88s
$\|g(x)\|$	1.50e-14	1.41e-14	6.16e-14
LBFGS-B	0.42s	0.78s	2.90s
$\|g(x)\|$	1.79e-07	1.17e-07	2.24e-07
TRF	0.35s	0.62s	0.92s
$\|g(x)\|$	7.83e-04	1.12e-04	6.67e-04



FIG. 5.8. *Obstacle problem A with c=1*

TABLE 5.11
Experiments on obstacle problem B with c=5

n	6400	10000	14400
APG-PAS	0.78s	0.90s	1.55s
$\|g(x)\|$	5.35E-14	3.66E-13	4.35E-13
LBFGS-B	4.23s	6.79s	25.55s
$\|g(x)\|$	4.37E-02	2.83E-02	4.16E-02
TRF	0.22s	0.34s	0.64s
$\|g(x)\|$	5.64E-04	5.37E-04	5.34E-03



FIG. 5.9. *Obstacle problem B with c=5*

TABLE 5.12
Experiments on elastic-plastic torsion problem with c=10

n	6400	10000	14400
APG-PAS	0.42s	0.93s	1.49s
$\|g(x)\|$	4.17E-14	1.45E-13	2.35E-09
LBFGS-B	2.68s	5.01s	18.59s
$\|g(x)\|$	8.85E-08	2.81E-06	1.29E-05
TRF	0.28s	0.41s	0.59s
$\|g(x)\|$	6.07E-04	3.32E-04	9.13E-04



FIG. 5.10. *Elastic-plastic torsion problem with c=10*

TABLE 5.13
Experiments on journal bearing problem with ϵ=0.8

n	6400	10000	14400
APG-PAS	0.32s	0.54s	1.04s
$\|g(x)\|$	8.07E-14	1.36E-13	1.76E-13
LBFGS-B	2.82s	4.44s	16.42s
$\|g(x)\|$	5.80E-07	1.05E-05	3.33E-05
TRF	0.41s	0.57s	0.94s
$\|g(x)\|$	1.24E-03	2.22E-03	2.44E-03



FIG. 5.11. *Journal bearing problem with ϵ=0.8*

TABLE 5.14
PAS method in qpOASES and the improved PAS method solving four discrete PDE optimization problems from the initial solution $\hat{z}$ like (4.11)

Problem	n	PAS(qpOASES) Iter	PAS(qpOASES) Time	PAS-Sort Iter	PAS-Sort Time
Obstacle A	6400	34	3.69s	29	0.10s
	10000	26	4.69s	22	0.14s
	14400	69	29.13s	66	0.54s
Obstacle B	6400	64	8.18	64	0.36s
	10000	90	23.67	88	0.50s
	14400	97	43.21	89	0.86s
Elastic-plastic torsion	6400	97	5.43	94	0.21
	10000	103	14.98	96	0.54
	14400	111	49.34	102	0.84
Journal bearing	6400	49	2.33	41	0.14
	10000	77	14.67	71	0.29
	14400	93	34.45	87	0.56

6. Conclusion. PPA is essentially linear iteration if the active-set is fixed. According to this, we show that PPA converges linearly at local and give an estimate of the linear convergence factor. Furthermore, based on this property, we present an accelerated PPA, which exhibits the obvious effect of acceleration.

APG algorithm converges slowly at end of the iterations, which hinders it to be an independent algorithm for (4.1), so we terminate it when some criterions are

satisfied. The performance of PAS highly depends on the initial solution. Then the approximately solving of APG is indispensable. With the approximately solving stage, the steps of PAS method in the second stage would greatly reduce. For these reasons, the two-stage algorithm is meaningful. Moreover, our sorting technique indeed reduces the computations for cholesky decomposition, which helps the second stage algorithm performs better.

Finally, the numerical results confirm our theoretical results well and show our algorithms are effective in practice. One advantage of our algorithms is that they can obtain high-precision solution.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank the colleagues for their valuable suggestions that led to the improvement of this paper.

REFERENCES

[1] F. Benvenuto, R. Zanella, L. Zanni, and M. Bertero, *Nonnegative least-squares image deblurring: improved gradient projection approaches*, Inverse Problems, 26 (2009), pp. 004–025.

[2] M. W. Berry, M. Browne, A. N. Langville, V. P. Pauca, and R. J. Plemmons, *Algorithms and applications for approximate nonnegative matrix factorization*, Computational Statistics & Data Analysis, 52 (2007), pp. 155–173.

[3] D. P. Bertsekas, *Projected newton methods for optimization problems with simple constraints*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 20 (1982), pp. 221–246.

[4] M. J. Best, *An algorithm for the solution of the parametric quadratic programming problem*, Springer, 1996.

[5] R. Bro and S. De Jong, *A fast non-negativity-constrained least squares algorithm*, Journal of Chemometrics, 11 (1997), pp. 393–401.

[6] R. H. Byrd, P. Lu, J. Nocedal, and C. Zhu, *A limited memory algorithm for bound constrained optimization*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 16 (1995), pp. 1190–1208.

[7] G. Capriz and G. Cimatti, *Free boundary problems in the theory of hydrodynamic lubrication: A survey*, Free Boundary Problems: Theory and Applications, A. Fasano and M. Primicerio, eds, (1983), pp. 613–635.

[8] G. Cimatti, *On a problem of the theory of lubrication governed by a variational inequality*, Applied Mathematics and Optimization, 3 (1976), pp. 227–242.

[9] T. F. Coleman and Y. Li, *A reflective newton method for minimizing a quadratic function subject to bounds on some of the variables*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 6 (1996), pp. 1040–1058.

[10] H. J. Ferreau, *An online active set strategy for fast solution of parametric quadratic programs with applications to predictive engine control*, University of Heidelberg, (2006).

[11] H. J. Ferreau, C. Kirches, A. Potschka, H. G. Bock, and M. Diehl, *qpoases: A parametric active-set algorithm for quadratic programming*, Mathematical Programming Computation, 6 (2014), pp. 327–363.

[12] R. Glowinski and J. T. Oden, *Numerical methods for nonlinear variational problems*, Journal of Applied Mechanics, 52 (1985), p. 739.

[13] M. Hanke, J. G. Nagy, and C. Vogel, *Quasi-newton approach to nonnegative image restorations*, Linear Algebra and its Applications, 316 (2000), pp. 223–236.

[14] D. Kim, S. Sra, and I. S. Dhillon, *Tackling box-constrained optimization via a new projected quasi-newton approach*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 32 (2010), pp. 3548–3563.

[15] C. L. Lawson and R. J. Hanson, *Solving least squares problems*, vol. 15, SIAM, 1995.

[16] C. J. Lin and J. J. Moré, *Newton's method for large bound-constrained optimization problems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 9 (1999), pp. 1100–1127.

[17] Z. Q. Luo and P. Tseng, *Error bounds and convergence analysis of feasible descent methods: a general approach*, Annals of Operations Research, 46 (1993), pp. 157–178.

[18] J. J. Moré and G. Toraldo, *On the solution of large quadratic programming problems with bound constraints*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 1 (1991), pp. 93–113.

[19] J. G. Nagy and D. P. O'Leary, *Restoring images degraded by spatially variant blur*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 19 (1998), pp. 1063–1082.

[20] J. G. Nagy and Z. Strakos, *Enforcing nonnegativity in image reconstruction algorithms*, in International Symposium on Optical Science and Technology, International Society for

Optics and Photonics, 2000, pp. 182–190.
[21] Y. Nesterov, *Smooth minimization of non-smooth functions*, Mathematical programming, 103 (2005), pp. 127–152.
[22] ———, *Gradient methods for minimizing composite objective function*, tech. report, UCL, 2007.
[23] G. C. Philippe, *The finite element method for elliptic problems*, 1978.
[24] K. Ritter, *On parametric linear and quadratic programming problems.*, tech. report, DTIC Document, 1981.
[25] R. T. Rockafellar, *Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm*, SIAM journal on Control and Optimization, 14 (1976), pp. 877–898.
[26] J. B. Rosen, *The gradient projection method for nonlinear programming. part i: Linear constraints*, Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 8 (1960), pp. 181–217.